

## REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application, as amended.

### Double Patenting Rejection

Applicant submits herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome this rejection.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-31 and 35-47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the serial frame aligner of Ikemura or the modular mapping system of Engbersen in view of the two-way communication link for computer chassis method of Allen.

First, the Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the serial frame aligner of Ikemura or the modular mapping system of Engbersen with the two-way communication link method for computer chassis method of Allen. Allen is designed for “messages that are sent out over a full duplex line communication line connecting two computer chassis” (col. 1, lines 6-12), while Ikemura and Engbersen are both used in high-speed fiber optic networks during processing of data being sent one way. (Ikemura col. 1, lines 6-9 ; Engbersen col. 1, lines 12-18 and col. 4, lines 3-7) One with ordinary skill in the art would not combine these references because their application areas are very different, and there would be no reasonable expectation of success per MPEP §2143.02. If the Examiner maintains this combination, further explanation is requested as to how they are combined and why the combination is proper per MPEP §2142.

Second, even if the combination were proper, the Applicant respectfully submits that this combination would not teach or describe all of the limitations of the Applicant’s claims. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with Office Action with respect to what is described in Ikemura and Engbersen. Ikemura describes “an alignment circuit for aligning frames of

serial data” (col. 10, lines 54-55) of a single signal with a single state machine with the purpose of reducing the size of byte and frame alignment circuitry. Engbersen describes “a apparatus for generating SONET/SDH compliant signals out of arbitrary tributaries” (col. 3, lines 61-64). Engbersen describes a “modular approach to the mapping of data in and from a standard SDH/SONET signal” (see abstract). The section of Engbersen (col. 10, lines 15-18) cited in the Office Action deals with the distribution of clock signals, “in particular the important frame sync signal,” to modules; there is no mention of a state machine, much less subsets of a set of state machines. The Office Action has not shown the claimed “simultaneously sync hunting” two signals (“the first” and “second signal”) with the subsets (“the first” and “second subset”) of a set of “per-alignment” state machines.” (Claims 1, 6, 10, 25, 35, 40, 44.)

In addition, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action when it states that claims 14, 20 and 25 have substantially the same limitations as claims 1-13. More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not put forth a prima facie case for rejecting claims 14, 20 and 25 because it does not address the elements of those claims. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited sections of the references, do not teach or make obvious the elements of those claims.

#### Amendments to Specification

Applicant has made amendments to the specification. The majority of these amendments return the application to its form as originally filed. However, some of these amendments correct typographical and labeling errors. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Notice Of Other Pending Applications

Applicant wants to put the Examiner on notice that there are other pending applications (09/835,704, pending; 09/835,474 pending) with basically the same specification as the above captioned application.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submits that in view of the remarks herein, claims 1-31 and 35-47 are now in condition for allowance, in addition to claims 32-34 and 48-50 previously allowed by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the Claims be allowed.

*Invitation for a telephone interview*

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 408-720-8300 if there remains any issue with allowance of this case.

*Charge our Deposit Account*

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 10/7, 2003



Daniel M. De Vos  
Reg. No. 37,813

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300